

Reply on Comment on “Extraction of work from a single thermal bath in the quantum regime”

(February 1, 2008)

In our recent letter [1] we discussed that thermodynamics is violated in quantum Brownian motion beyond the weak coupling limit. In his comment, Tasaki [2] derives an inequality for the relative entropy and claims, without making any dynamical assumption, that the Clausius inequality is valid, thus contradicting our statements [1]. Here we point out that the claim is unfounded, since the author did not properly identify the concept of heat. Tasaki also applies the inequality to Thomson’s formulation of the second law. This application is invalid as well, since the author did not correctly identify the concept of work. Therefore, Tasaki’s inequality is perfectly compatible with our findings.

To facilitate the reading of the present reply, we will use some notations of Tasaki. As in [1,2], we consider a quantum system which consists of a subsystem and a bath. The Hamiltonian of the subsystem $H_s(t)$ depends on time through some of its parameters; that of the bath H_b is time-independent, and that for interaction $H_{\text{int}}(t)$ may be time-dependent. The total Hamiltonian is $H(t) = H_s(t) \otimes \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1} \otimes H_b + H_{\text{int}}(t)$. Initially the subsystem is in an arbitrary equilibrium state with density matrix ρ_s^{init} , and the bath is in the Gibbs state with inverse temperature β . The density matrix for the whole system is $\rho^{\text{init}} = \rho_s^{\text{init}} \otimes \exp[-\beta H_b]/Z(\beta)$, where $Z(\beta) = \text{Tr}_b[\exp\{-\beta H_b\}]$ is the partition function for the bath. (Tr_s , Tr_b stand for the traces over the spaces of the system and the bath, and Tr indicates the full trace.) Let ρ^{fin} be the density matrix at the final moment obtained from the time evolution according to $H(t)$. Tasaki makes *no assumptions* about the nature of the time evolution or of the final state ρ^{fin} . Using well-known properties of the quantum relative entropy, he then derives the following inequality

$$S_{\text{vN}}[\rho_s^{\text{fin}}] - S_{\text{vN}}[\rho_s^{\text{init}}] \geq \beta [\langle H_b \rangle_{\text{init}} - \langle H_b \rangle_{\text{fin}}], \quad (1)$$

where $S_{\text{vN}}[\rho_s] = -\text{Tr}_s[\rho_s \log \rho_s]$ is the von Neuman entropy of the subsystem. Then Tasaki claims that $\langle H_b \rangle_{\text{init}} - \langle H_b \rangle_{\text{fin}}$ is the *heat* that flowed out of the bath during the process. Therefore, for him, Eq. (1) becomes the Clausius inequality.

We have no doubts on the mathematical correctness of Eq. (1). Nevertheless we completely disagree with identification of $\langle H_b \rangle_{\text{init}} - \langle H_b \rangle_{\text{fin}}$ as heat. Let first indicate that in [1] we have used a completely different definition, which appears to be widely accepted in literature [3]. We will show that this common definition never coincides with that given by Tasaki. Then we will argue that the definition of Tasaki is hardly physical.

Since the complete system is closed, its dynamics is given by the von Neumann equation

$$\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H(t)\rho(t) - \rho(t)H(t)] \quad (2)$$

It is easy to see from Eq. (2) that $\text{Tr}(H \frac{d}{dt} \rho) \equiv dQ_{\text{tot}} = 0$, which then implies

$$0 = Q_{\text{tot}} = \int_{t_{\text{in}}}^t dQ_{\text{tot}} = -\Delta Q_0 + \Delta Q_s + \Delta Q_{\text{int}}, \quad (3)$$

$$\Delta Q_0 = \langle H_b \rangle_{\text{init}} - \langle H_b \rangle_{\text{fin}}, \quad (4)$$

$$\Delta Q_s = \int_{t_{\text{in}}}^t dt' \text{Tr}_s[H_s(t') \frac{d}{dt'} \rho_s(t')], \quad (5)$$

$$\Delta Q_{\text{int}} = \int_{t_{\text{in}}}^t dt' \text{Tr}[H_{\text{int}}(t') \frac{d}{dt'} \rho(t')] \quad (6)$$

The interpretation of these equations is straightforward. ΔQ_{tot} is the heat obtained by the total system, and it is zero since the system is closed. ΔQ_s is heat gotten by the particle from the thermal bath, since if there is no interaction with the bath, the evolution of the subsystem is by itself unitary, and this quantity is zero. ΔQ_s directly appears in the first law as the energy of the subsystem [1,3]. Moreover, it contains only characteristics of the subsystem, the observable ones. Therefore, it can be controlled and measured in experiment. Taking into account all these factors, as well as experimental confirmations, a great amount of scientists got a conclusion that this quantity has to be identified with heat [3].

ΔQ_0 is the quantity proposed as heat by Tasaki. This will be an alternative definition if one can show that there are sensible limits, where $\Delta Q_0 = \Delta Q_s$. However, it is easy to see that this is not the case, since ΔQ_{int} is never zero, except when $H_{\text{int}} \rightarrow 0$, where all terms in r.h.s. of Eq. (3) are zero separately, and there is no reason to speak of heat. The situation will not change if H_{int} will be put to zero starting from some control time, since ΔQ_{int} is still non-zero. On the other hand, the definition of Tasaki involves degrees of freedom of the bath, which are unobservable and uncontrollable by the very definition of the problem. So ΔQ_0 can even not be observed directly. It also does not appear in the first law for the particle, whereas the standard definition does [1,3].

There is nevertheless some small space for a *modification* of Tasaki’s definition. It arises when one is interested in a small amount of heat obtained between

t and $t + dt$, where $t \gg t^{\text{in}}$. Having taken the standard weak-coupling assumption [4], one considers H_{int} as small, and then *approximately* puts $dQ_0 = \text{Tr}_b[H_b d\rho_b]$ equal to $dQ_s = \text{Tr}_s[H_s d\rho_s]$. In this weak-coupling limit we found that the Clausius inequality is valid [1]. The result of Tasaki does not bear on this case, since for his derivation it seems to be important to start at $t = t^{\text{in}}$ and consider the integral amount of heat. But the weak coupling assumption does not apply at early times. Thus his result is irrelevant even for this standard limit, where the Clausius inequality is known to be valid. The reason is that the author did not take into account any dynamical factor. We will be surprised if Tasaki would be able to derive the proper Clausius inequality without making any dynamical assumptions, since all derivations known to us use certain, although not the same, set of assumptions (see [5] and refs. there). In this context we recall that our derivations in [1] are exact (although model-dependent), and concern the case, where those assumptions are invalid.

Let us now mention that Tasaki uses Eq. (1) to derive the impossibility of the perpetuum mobile, which he understands as a violation of the Thomson's formulation of the second law: *No work can be extracted from the thermal bath and subsystem during a cyclical process*, by a large number of identical circles. In this context ΔQ_0 appears for him also as the extracted work. This is again incorrect, since if a parameter α of the subsystem is varying with time then the extracted work ΔW is given as [1,3]

$$\int_{t^{\text{in}}}^t dt' \frac{d\alpha}{dt'} \text{Tr}_s \left[\frac{\partial H_s}{\partial \alpha} \rho_s(t') \right] = \int_{t^{\text{in}}}^t dt' \frac{d\alpha}{dt'} \text{Tr}_{s,b} \left[\frac{\partial H}{\partial \alpha} \rho(t') \right]$$

and this is just the work extracted by external sources from the total system. Needless to mention that $\Delta Q_0 \neq \Delta W$. So this statement of Tasaki is also incorrect.

R. Balian is acknowledged for interesting discussions.

We thank Hal Tasaki for communicating us his result before to make it public.

-
- [1] A.E. Allahverdyan and Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1799 (2000) (cond-mat/0006404).
 - [2] H. Tasaki, cond-mat/0011099.
 - [3] The literature devoted to the correct interpretation of heat and work is broad. We will cite only few well-known books: J. Keizer, *Statistical Thermodynamics of Nonequilibrium Processes*, (Springer-Verlag, 1987)
R. Balian, *From Microphysics to Macrophysics*, I, II, (Springer-Verlag, 1992)
Yu. L. Klimontovich, *Statistical Theory of Open Systems*, (Kluwer, Amsterdam, 1997)
 - [4] C.W. Gardiner, *Quantum Noise*, Springer-Verlag, 1991.
 - [5] A.E. Allahverdyan and D.B. Saakian, Phys.Rev. E **58** 1148 (1998)

A.E. Allahverdyan^{1,3)} and Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen²⁾

¹⁾S.Ph.T., CEA Saclay, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette cedex, France;

²⁾Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Amsterdam,
Valckenierstraat 65, 1018 XE Amsterdam, The Netherlands;

³⁾Yerevan Physics Institute,
Alikhanian Brothers St. 2, Yerevan 375036, Armenia.